



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,147	02/12/2007	Paul Oommen	873.0167.U1(US)	5639
29683	7590	03/24/2010		
HARRINGTON & SMITH				
4 RESEARCH DRIVE, Suite 202				
SHELTON, CT 06484-6212				
EXAMINER				
MCADAMS, BRAD				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2456				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/24/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/576,147

Applicant(s)

OOMMEN ET AL.

Examiner

ROBERT B. MCADAMS

Art Unit

2456

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 December 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/200)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the amendment filed on December 24, 2009.
2. Claims 1-29 are pending.

Response to Amendment

3. Applicant's amendments, see Claims 26-29, filed 12/24/2009, with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of Claims 26-29 have been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 12/24/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to Claims 1, 11, 22 and 26, the Applicant argues, page 8, *Noneman* does not disclose "determining at the device a type of multicast content". The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The "SERVICE_OPTION" and "SPECIAL_SERVICE" fields are used to determine a particular multicast service within an origination message (Column 4, Lines 28-50). Therefore, the "multicast content", is determined when a particular multicast service is defined by the SERVICE_OPTION as the SERVICE_OPTION is a 16 bit representation of the contents or type of the multicast (Column 6, Lines 22-31).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. **Claims 1-6 and 11-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Noneman* (U.S. Patent No. 5,887,252).

As to **Claims 1 and 11**, *Noneman* discloses

receiving at a device (**Mobile Station, MS**) a multicast message flow (**Message**) comprising content and a flow identification (**MS receives a message containing service content and flow identification, Service_Option and Special_Service. Column 4, Lines 30-53**) ;

determining at the device a type of content from a multicast identification information that comprises a part of the flow identification (**A particular multicast service is determined based on the Service_Option value. Column 4, Lines 35-41**); and

passing the flow to an appropriate content processing entity (**MS receives and processes the content. Steps 40 and 50, Figure 2; Column 5, Lines 41-49**).

As to **Claims 2 and 12**, *Noeman* further discloses sending a request from the device to obtain information about a multicast program from a content server (**MS**

sends an origination message requesting service parameters from the BS.

Paragraph bridging Columns 4 and 5).

As to **Claims 3 and 13**, *Noeman* further discloses where the multicast identification information comprises security information associated with the content **(Message fields, Multicast_group for specifying long code mask, added to the message are used for descrambling the received message from the BS. Column 5, Lines 1-10 and 42-45).**

As to **Claims 4 and 14**, *Noeman* further discloses the device receiving from a content server a list of multicast flows as part of the multicast identification information **(Service_Option includes all of the multicast flows. Column 4, Lines 30-53).**

As to **Claims 5 and 15**, *Noeman* further discloses selecting a multicast program based on the multicast identification information via a user interface of the device **(Column 6, Lines 22-32).**

As to **Claims 6 and 16**, *Noeman* further discloses the device selectively requesting from a content server descriptive information regarding a multicast content flow **(Server_Option numbers represent descriptive information for selecting a particular multicast content flow. Column 4, Lines 30-42).**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 7, 17, 21-22 and 26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Noneman* (U.S. Patent No. 5,887,252) in view of *Brunet* (U.S. PGPub. No. 2004/0203755 A1).

As to **Claims 7 and 17**, *Noeman* discloses the wireless data communications system as previously discussed in Claim 6.

However, *Noeman* does not expressly disclose wherein the descriptive information concerns an update of at least one of firmware and application data.

Brunet, in the same field of endeavor, teaches descriptive information concerns an update to at least one of firmware and application data (**Mobile Care Framework 1 allows application and firmware updates to be stored and made available to Mobile users. Paragraph 0091**).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the wireless data communication system as taught by *Noeman* with providing firmware and application updates as taught by *Brunet*. The motivation would have been to keep mobile users updated.

As to **Claims 21, 22 and 26** *Noeman-Brunet* teach where said multicast identification information is represented as a data structure (**Noeman; Message. Column 4, Lines 29-41**) and where said controller is operable to parse said data structure to retrieve flow-related information therefrom (**Noeman; Column 4, Lines 63-67**), said data structure comprising fields that include a type identification field specifying a flow type (**Noeman; Service_Option**); a provider identification field for identifying a provider of firmware; a vendor identification for identifying a vendor of firmware; and an application identification field for identifying an application in the mobile host that uses the content delivered in the flow (**Brunet; Figure 2, 320A/B and 330A; Paragraphs 0081-0084**)

9. **Claims 8, 18, 23 and 27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Noneman* (U.S. Patent No. 5,887,252) in view of *Mittal* (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,685).

As to **Claims 8, 18, 23 and 27**, *Noneman* discloses the wireless multicast communication system as previously discussed in Claim 1.

However *Noneman* does not expressly disclose where the multicast identification information is represented using one of Extended Markup Language (XML), or Synchronization Markup Language (SyncML), for transmission over-the-air (OTA).

Mittal, in the same field of endeavor, teaches where the multicast identification information is represented using Synchronization Markup Language (SyncML),
(Column 3, Lines 12-35).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the multicast identification information as taught by *Noneman* with using SyncML as taught by *Mittal*. The motivation would have been to use a standard technique for transfer of information.

10. **Claims 9-10, 19-20, 24-25 and 28-29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Noneman* (U.S. Patent No. 5,887,252) in view of *Zhu* (U.S. PGPub. No. 2005/0055397).

As to **Claims 9-10, 19-20, 24-25 and 28-29**, *Noneman* discloses the wireless multicast communication system as previously discussed in Claim 1.

However *Noneman* does not expressly disclose where multicast identification information associated with different multicast flows is represented in a tree-like structure associated with an Open Mobile Alliance Device Management framework.

Zhu, in the same field of endeavor, teaches where representing in a tree-like structure associated with an Open Mobile Alliance Device Management framework
(Abstract; Paragraphs 0006 and 0034).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the multicast identification information as taught by

Noneman with using a tree-like structure associated with OMA as taught by *Zhu*. The motivation would have been to use a standard for easier management of information.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **ROBERT B. MCADAMS** whose telephone number is (571)270-3309. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 5:30am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. B. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 2456

/Rupal D. Dharia/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2400